

SLAVERY JUSTIFIED.

THE SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Alton Locke, Tailor and Poet: an Auto-biography: has recently been the subject of review in the Edinburgh, the North British, and Blackwood. Each of these able Reviews admits that *Alton Locke*, in the main, gives a fair picture of the state of the poor in England, and that their condition is intolerable, and daily growing worse. Blackwood and the North British Review farther admit, with the Socialists, that this desperate condition of the poor is owing to free competition, or liberty; and even the Edinburgh, with all its love for political economy, distinctly alleges that a cure for the sufferings of the working classes may be found by recurring to the old order of things:—feudalism, vassalage and serfdom. It further appears from these Reviews, that socialism, with thinking men, is almost universal in England. Except the Edinburgh Review, and a little clique that adhere to it, all men agree that free competition has brought on the evils under which the Empire is suffering, and that free competition must be checked and corrected, or the Empire be subverted. Now free competition is nothing in the world but the absence of domestic slavery; and these Reviews, all though afraid to use the word, do in effect distinctly admit that the intolerable condition of the working classes is owing to the absence of that form of domestic

slavery which afforded support and protection to the poor in feudal times. Experience has universally shown, that the slavery of the working classes to the rich, which grows out of liberty and equality, or free competition, is ten times more onerous and exacting than domestic slavery. The bathos of human misery is to be a slave without a master. Such is the condition of the poor in the free States of Europe; they are slaves without masters. They have no houses, no property, none to protect them, none to care for them. In the fierce competition for employment, the intense struggle to get a livelihood, and the ruinous underbidding it occasions, we see the rich devouring the poor, and the poor devouring one another. This process is well described by the Chartist, Crossthwaite, in Alton Locke:

“It is a sin to add our weight to the crowd of artisans who are now choking and strangling each other to death, as the prisoners did in the black hole of Calcutta. Let those who will, turn beasts of prey and feed upon their fellows; but let us at least keep ourselves pure. It may be the law of political civilization, that the rich should eat up the poor, and the poor eat up each other. Then, I here rise and curse that law, that civilization, that nature. Either I will destroy them or they shall destroy me. As a slave, as an increased burden on my fellow-sufferers, I will not live. So help me God! I will take no more work to my house, and I call upon all to sign a protest to that effect.”

England is a Garden of Eden, in which the birds of the air, the fishes of the sea, and the beasts of the field participate equally with the owners of the soil in the

fruits of the earth. The working man alone, who has made this garden to blossom like the rose, is excluded from its enjoyment. *Hiatus, valde deflendus!* And he is excluded simply because he is not like the horse and the ox, and the sheep, the fish in the pond and the game in the preserves, the property of the owner of the soil. Make him also property, and he would be better fed and cared for than the brutes, for he is more valuable property; and besides, it is more natural for man to love his fellow man, provided that fellow man be his dependant or his master, than it is to love brute creatures. God, when he created the world, established a community of goods, not only between men, but also let in the brute creation to their full share of enjoyment of the fruits of the earth. An attempt has been made in Southern and middle Europe, for the last century or two, to establish a new order of things on the ruins of feudalism, which was a modification of the old order. This attempt has signally failed, as is attested by almost daily revolutions, the starving condition of the working classes, and the general prevalence of socialist doctrines, which doctrines propose the total subversion and re-construction of the social fabric. We entirely agree with the socialists, that free competition is the bane of modern society. We also agree with them, that it is right and necessary to establish in some modified degree, a community of property. We agree with them in the end they propose to attain, and only differ as to the means.

We do not believe that any new discoveries have been made in moral science for the last four thousand years,

or that any will hereafter be made. In the remotest antiquity, men had the same lights of experience before them that we have to-day, and they were wiser men and profounder thinkers than we, because their attention was not divided and frittered away, by a thousand objects, wants and pursuits, as ours is, in consequence of the many discoveries in physical science. The ancients led simpler lives, were harrassed by fewer cares, had their minds exercised on fewer subjects, and were therefore wiser men than we. Their works are imperishable, and have a reputation as wide as the world. The fame of the best of ours is ephemeral and local. It is to them we should recur for lessons in government, rather than look to our contemporaries or indulge in rash experiment. Thousands of years before the days of Moses and Numa, Solon and Lycurgus, the field of experiment had been exhausted, and they no doubt were aware of the results of those experiments, and profited by them.

So little has human nature changed, that we find the men of to-day, with all their virtues and vices, passions and peculiarities, more exactly and faithfully portrayed in the Old Testament, and by the Greek and Latin poets, than by any English or American author of the present day. It is with human nature that government has to deal, and we should look back to those who understood it best, to learn how to deal with it. The Socialists expect to organise society on entirely new principles. Society every where is much alike and of gradual growth. It is the result of the passions, the motives, the affections, and the selfishness of human

nature. These are much the same in all ages and in all countries. What madness and folly, at this late day, to form society for human beings regardless of human nature. Yet the Socialists are guilty of this folly, and gravely propose to change man's nature to fit him for their new institutions. How much more wise, prudent and philosophical it would be to recur to some old tried forms of society, especially as we shall presently show that such forms of society have existed, and do now exist, as will remove all the evils they complain of, and attain all the ends they propose.

A community of property, in some modified degree, existed in all the states of antiquity, whether savage or civilized, and continued to exist under the form of feudalism throughout the dark ages. This community of property existed in two forms. The one form, universal among savages, is where the lands belong to the State and the individuals composing the State have a common right of enjoyment in those lands. Society may get along very happily under this order of things. Nor, indeed, is it wholly inconsistent with the advance of civilization. Every one recollects the example of Sparta, when there was no separate property in lands, and in modern times the Peruvian Indians, the most civilized in America, held their lands in common. The few instances, however, of this kind of community of property among civilized nations, shows that it is adapted only to the savage state. The other kind of community of property, which is at least as old as civilization itself, will require some pains to explain, because we are the first who have treated it in this light. No doubt the same re-

flections are daily passing through thousands of minds, that now pass through ours, and we but give a new name to an old thought. This latter kind of community of property exists where separate ownership having been acquired in all the soil of a State, those who own that soil own also those individuals who cultivate it. A beautiful example and illustration of this kind of communism, is found in the instance of the Patriarch Abraham. His wives and his children, his men servants and his maid servants, his camels and his cattle, were all equally his property. He could sacrifice Isaac or a ram, just as he pleased. He loved and protected all, and all shared, if not equally, at least fairly, in the products of their light labor. Who would not desire to have been a slave of that old Patriarch, stern and despotic as he was? How quick he would have beheaded a Yankee abolitionist who had abused his open hospitality to entice away his slaves. Poor Hagar! wert thou deluded by some vender of quack medicines and wooden nutmegs? How many Hagar's, starving in the wilderness, may now be found at the North? Nay, it is worse than a wilderness to them, for they are surrounded by luxuries which they cannot taste, and by fellow beings whose hideous scowl of hate aggravates their woes. Pride, affection, self-interest, moved Abraham to protect, love and take care of his slaves. The same motives operate on all masters, and secure comfort, competency and protection to the slave. A man's wife and children are his slaves, and do they not enjoy, in common with himself, his property? As he advances in age and his wants become fewer, his chil-

dren most always get the lion's share. Look to a well ordered farm and see whether the cattle, the horses, the sheep, and the hogs, do not enjoy their full proportion of the proceeds of the farm. Would you emancipate them too? Why not? Liberty and idleness are as natural and agreeable to them as to slaves.

Men love the brute creatures that belong to them. It is the law of God impressed on the heart of man that secures good and kind treatment to the brutes, far more effectually than all human law can do. The same law of God makes man love his slaves far more than he does his horse. The affection which all men feel for what belongs to them, and for what is dependent on them, is Nature's magna charta, which shields, protects and provides for wives, children and slaves. The selfishness of man's nature, which occasions all the oppression of the weak by the powerful, the poor by the rich, in free society, is the very instrument which Providence in his wisdom has chosen to protect the weak and the poor in a natural and healthy state of society—that is in a society where domestic slavery exists. Ye meddlesome, profane, presumptuous abolitionists! think ye that God has done his work imperfectly and needs your aid? He that takes account of the sparrow, has he no care for the slave? Is he waiting, and has he waited for four thousand years, for you to do his work? Must you steal the negro before he can save his soul? Are not the negroes whom you have stolen and freed, ten times more vicious than our slaves? Has God permitted slavery to exist so long and so generally, because he knew no better, or be-

cause he was afraid to denounce it, or was he waiting for you to help him?

In the February No. of the North British Review, in a critique on Sir Charles Lyell's Travels in North America, we find the following singular and contradictory language. We say contradictory, for if "self-interest and domestic feeling combine to surround the slave with every blessing," what becomes of the "cruelty and injustice," the "sound of the whip and the clank of the chain?" Does domestic feeling exhibit itself in this way?

"Could we look at the slave in his simple humanity, without regarding him as a being of the future, we should view him as the inmate of a luxurious house, with all the blessings with which self-interest and domestic feeling combine to surround him. Under this bright phase, and in striking contrast with the in-dweller of the work-house, or the laborer in the factory, we are disposed to forget the horrors of the middle passage, and shut our ears to the sound of the whip and the clank of the chain. But when the mind's eye rests upon the precious jewel—the white soul which the clay cask encloses—eternal truth recoils from the sight of a spirit in shackles, and immortal affection clasps in her warmest embrace the victims of cruelty and injustice."

We suppose the writer thinks there are no slaves in heaven, but plenty of savages, cannibals and free negroes. "The Devil can quote scripture for his purpose," but we think this would puzzle him.

If any doubt our theory, that domestic slavery does establish a fair community of goods, we cite them to

the facts. Look to the old Patriarchs and their slaves, to the feudal lords and their vassals, or come to the South and see our farms. See the aged and infirm, the women and children, on every farm, more tenderly watched over and better provided for, than the sturdy and laborious. God intended, no doubt, that those who most needed sympathy, assistance and attention, should have most of it. Put your own house in order, ye abolitionists? When the women and children, the sick and the aged, in your laboring class, are secure of the same ample provision, sympathy and attention as our slaves, then, and not till then, offer your advice to us.

But we have said the slave is secure of a *fair* proportion of the profits in the community of property which grows out of the institution of domestic slavery. We will explain how this happens, and cite facts to prove that it is so. As man rises in the scale of civilization his wants increase, his skill and capacity for production increase *pari passu*. As a slave, he needs more and is entitled to more, of the products of the joint concern, than the mere newly imported savage. As he assimilates himself to his master, his master's attachment to him increases; he is made a mechanic, a dining-room or body servant, and is treated very differently from what we call "out hands." Each, however, has his wants supplied. The negroes first imported to this country were badly clad; clothes to them were an irksome incumbrance. Our male field hands even now generally prefer a bench by the fire and a blanket, to the finest feather bed in the world. They are but gradually learning to like plank floors to their houses. The

masters are more ready to supply their wants than they are to acquire them.

There is another law of our nature that secures to the slave his right. Place men in the relation of master and slave, and the wiser and more strong willed invariably rules. It is so in the case of man and wife, father and child, and slaves have often been "a power behind the throne greater than the throne itself," and thus ruled empires. Negroes do not rule their masters, because of the inferiority of race, but they are better treated as they advance in morality and intelligence.

Besides that domestic slavery does away with competition, so ruinous to the working classes in free countries, and occasions a community of profits if not of property—it supplies another great desideratum of the socialists, and, indeed, of the political economists too: it brings about the **ASSOCIATION OF LABOR**. This result, too, is obtained in a better form than any we have seen suggested by the Socialists. They propose only to associate men of the same trade. Domestic slavery profitably associates men, women and children, mechanics and common laborers. On a farm, under the supervision of one master, who supplies the skill and capital, all ages and sexes can find appropriate and profitable employment. Set the slaves on a farm free, and leave each to get employment, and however disposed to work, the products of their labor would not sit half what they ~~were~~ before. Much time must be lost in looking for work, and they would rarely find beuations where all the members of a large family could

get employment. Much loss would ensue from the want of one common head to find them work and give skillful direction to their labor, and still more from the fact that each one buying for himself, their wants would be supplied at retail instead of wholesale prices.

This association of labor and capital, by means of domestic slavery, would remove another evil that bewilders, staggers and confounds Malthusians, Economists and Socialists alike. This is the evil of excessive population, an evil sorely felt through half of Europe, and irremediable because confined to the most indigent who have no means of emigrating. If they were slaves, their masters would send them at once to countries where population was sparse and labor dear; and they would be sent off in families, not separated as free people generally are when they remove. Thus is slavery the simple and adequate remedy for the greatest evil with which mankind is afflicted at present or threatened for the future.

We cannot believe that the Socialists do not see that domestic slavery is the only practicable form of socialism—they are afraid yet to pronounce the word.

An admirable proof and illustration of our doctrine, that slavery is communism, might be had by making all the working-men in England slaves to the land-holders, and requiring by law the land-holders to support them as we do our slaves. Would not, in such case, the working-men be joint owners of the farm? If the land-holders were also permitted to sell them, or remove them to the colonies where labor is scarce and dear, it would be an excellent bargain on both sides. Labor and capi-

tal would thus be beneficially associated. They do sell white men now in England, and remove them to distant colonies, but require as a perquisite to the boon, that a man should first steal a turnip or shoot a hare. Many take the boon even on these harsh terms, rather than starve; they steal in order to be shipped to New Holland and sold as slaves. They are willing to encounter the disgrace of crime, and be torn from every tie of friendship and affection, rather than remain in England and starve. Could the poor of England sell themselves and families for terms of years, or for life, or in perpetuity, they would at once have the means of certain and comfortable support. Removed to new colonies, they might by extra work and frugality, soon purchase their liberty again. The situation of the slave is a good one to amass money, because he may save all he makes, the master supplying all his wants.

We have often been reminded of the absurdity of the law which prevents a man's selling himself, or to speak more accurately, which refuses to enforce performance of the contract, whilst observing the character of the emigration to California. No poor man could get to the mines, except by deserting the army, the navy, or the merchant service. The law permitted him to sell his liberty for five years, and subject himself to hard fare and harsh treatment, and low wages, provided he would enter either of those services. He might sell himself for eight dollars a month, and have the cat applied to his back gratis once a quarter, but he might not sell himself for fifty dollars per month to work in the mines and be well treated. The law, we know, is

the perfection of reason, and liberty the greatest good, yet we can't help thinking, when a strong young fellow finds his whole capital reduced to his own person, it would be as well to let him pawn that or sell it, "to make a raise." It is the only way a poor fellow can get a start in life sometimes, and it seems hard to prohibit his using, in the way of trade, the only capital he has left. We wonder it never occurred to the economists, who so much admire free trade and free competition, that the denial of this right was part of the restrictive and protective system. *Laissez nous faire!* Let us sell ourselves if we please!

That the condition of working men, in all old countries where population is dense, is a thousand times worse than that of our slaves, is a **FACT** that no one will dispute. This *fact* is worth all the theories in the world, and shows conclusively that the common laborers should be slaves, in old countries. It is hard for us Americans to understand why this must ever be so, for here population is generally sparse, and working men scarce; so that working men are in demand and can get just such wages as they choose to demand. Mrs. Trollope, by far the most philosophical traveller who has visited America, very justly remarked, that the difficulty of retaining a servant in Cincinnati, showed that there the master or employer was under obligations to the servant. The servant might work one day in the week and get enough wages to live on all the week; the master needed a servant every day and could with difficulty get one, because masters were more numerous than servants. The **COMPETITION** was among masters to get

servants, not among servants to get places. This competition of course continually increased the wages of servants. We will venture the assertion, based upon mere theory, that this state of things is already changed in Ohio—servants have become more numerous than employers. There is already competition and under-bidding to get places, because population is dense; and we will stake our reputation, that the white servants in Cincinnati are not as well paid as our negro slaves. We mean that their wages are not sufficient to secure to them and their families the same comforts in all seasons of the year, in health, and in sickness, as we allow our slaves. In a newly and partially settled country like California, working men have greatly the advantage over mere moneyed men, and slavery is not necessary for their protection. Competition in such countries is attended with no evils, and greatly promotes the rapid development of its resources. In settling a new country, free labor is better than slave labor, because competition stimulates industry, without impairing the condition of the laborer. In old countries, every stimulant to increased industry is an injury to the laboring class, for thereby a few do the work that should employ many, and thus leave the many to starve. In old countries, human wisdom can devise no effectual means to provide for the poor, where lands have become separate property, except by making slaves of those who hold no property to those who have property, and thus in fact, if not in form, establishing a community of property. The history of the free States of Europe, for the last sixty years, and the present condition of the poor in

those States, we think conclusively proves this. All parties admit that society there requires radical change. They must go back to domestic slavery. Civilized society cannot long exist without it. In conclusion, we will sum up the evidence that establishes this truth beyond doubt, independent of all theory. In the slave States of this Union all classes of society are satisfied with government as it is; famine is neither known nor apprehended, and there is no complaint that the wages of the working class are inadequate to their comfortable support. In the whole South there is not one Socialist, not one man, rich or poor, proposing to subvert and re-construct society. Society is in a natural, healthy and contented state. Such was very much the condition of society in middle and southern Europe two centuries ago, before feudalism disappeared and liberty and equality were established. Now, in these latter countries, famine and revolutions are daily occurrences; the poor are discontented, riotous and insurrectionary, and the rich, from mere sympathy with the sufferings of the poor, have become young English men, Chartist and Socialists, and admit that the organization of society is wholly wrong, and the sufferings of the poor intolerable. What more proof is needed, that the diseases that afflict society with them are occasioned by the absence of domestic slavery, and what remedy so obvious as to remove the cause of those diseases by restoring that institution?